

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS***General:***

Claims 16-38 are pending in this application. Claims 16-21, 22-24, 26-28, 30, 32-33, and 35-38 are amended as discussed below. No new matter is added by this amendment.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2)

Claims 16, 18, 26, 35, and 37 are rejected as indefinite on the ground that the memory, and not the identifiers, are divided into subfields. Claims 16, 18, 26, 35, and 37 have been amended to delete the word “subfield.” Consequential amendments have been made to dependent claims. Claims 16, 18, 26, 35, and 37 are believed now to be definite.

Claims 20, 23, 30, and 32 are rejected as indefinite on the ground that “it is not clear to what memory the faster memory and the slower memory are referring or comparing.” It is believed to be implicit that they are “faster” and “slower” compared to each other. That has now been made explicit. Consequential amendments have been made to dependent claims. Claims 20, 23, 30, and 32 are believed now to be definite.

No specific grounds of indefiniteness were alleged against the dependent claims. They are assumed to have been rejected because of their dependency from rejected claims, or because of reciting the same terms considered to be indefinite in their respective base claims. The dependent claims are therefore believed now to be definite for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16-19, 26-29, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. patent 6,421,651 (Tedesco), for reasons set out in the office action mailed September 13, 2005 and in the office action mailed February 22, 2006. Applicant traverses this rejection. Tedesco teaches generating an identifier by incrementing the previous identifier. The examiner argues it would have been obvious to store a working copy in volatile RAM and a backup copy in non-volatile memory. However, that would result in identical data being stored in both memories. Applicant previously explained that Tedesco does not teach or suggest splitting

different portions of the identifier between volatile and non-volatile, or fast and slow, memories. The examiner contends that claims 16-19, 26-29, and 35-38, as previously amended, do not clearly recite splitting portions of the identifier. Claims 16, 18, 26, 35, and 37 are amended to remove the impression, inadvertently introduced by the previous amendment, that a predetermined identifier including both the number and the range is stored in both memories. The range and number are parts of the *unique* identifier, not parts of the *predetermined* identifier. Claims 16, 18, 26, 35, and 37 now clearly recite that the number and range are stored in one memory, and data representative of the range are stored in another memory, and are believed to be clearly distinguished over the disclosure of Tedesco.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are requested.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of all rejections, and an early notice of allowance of claims 16-38, are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD P. HELLIWELL

BY: 

GREGORY J. LAVORGNA
Registration No. 30,469
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square
18th & Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
Tel: (215) 988-3309
Fax: (215) 988-2757
Attorney for Applicant